

The Government undoubtedly is, as it ought to be, anxious, in interests of higher education, to grant all possible assistance; its duty to act decisively in this particular obviously arises from the inherent in our system of government by party. It is supposed that further grants to the State institution would arouse a storm of opposition in the denominational colleges, but it may be fairly questioned whether this difficulty is not largely illusory. In this Province, as in the other, denominational institutions are reaping the benefits of voluntary contributions, an avenue to wealth that is practically closed (except in rare instances) to any State institution. From this point of view it would be unfair on their part if they sought to debar us from applying to the Legislature, a source proper to us, and to which we are confined, but to which, under our system of government, they have no right. From these and other considerations, it seems very probable that a bold step on the part of the Government in appropriating a portion of the surplus would not call forth any violent expressions of disapprobation. The grant might take a less invidious shape if some of the waste lands of the Province were appropriated. But these, however, are matters of detail; the great question is to prevail on the Legislature to decide in favor of the general scheme.

We would therefore venture to recommend to the members of Convocation that they would now effect some informal organization with a view to definitive action next June. A strong expression of opinion, properly followed up, would at once bring to bear on the Legislature the powerful influence of our graduates, who do not seem to know their own strength. A necessary step would be to interest the members of Convocation outside of Toronto in its proceedings; this has already been done with marked success, and could be done again. The important task of settling some definite scheme will probably fall into the hands of Toronto graduates, and could be decided in one or two informal meetings. No more favorable opportunity than the present could well be imagined, and if a bold and decisive step is ever to be taken, it should be taken now.

C.

Undergraduate thinks that the seizure of books by the Custom House censor is an incident in which the readers of the 'Varsity have no interest. These students, actually or presumably, spend much of their time in the study of books; and if unlimited license be given to the literary censor enthroned in the Custom House, their studies would be in danger of being interrupted by a seizure of text books; for it is quite impossible to say what a Custom House censor, restricted by no list of prohibited books, and at liberty to exercise an arbitrary discretion, might not take upon himself to do. We certainly did not intend to say anything against the Roman Catholic Church as such; and we do not think that the occurrence of the words "Ultramontane party" and "Protestantism," in the paragraph in question, is a capital crime. In the Province of Quebec, that party has just received a rap over the knuckles from Rome for its attack on the University at Laval. When dogmatic intolerance is translated into civil intolerance, exercised through the Custom House, the 'Varsity will not consent to remain silent. If the intolerance had not got beyond the dogmatic stage, no reference would have been made to it in these columns. Dogmatic intolerance, the Abbé Pâquet tells the students of Laval, is the sheet anchor of the Church of Rome—a reliance which she can never consent to relinquish. His lectures containing this declaration are reprinted at the press of the Propaganda, at Rome, with the approval of high authorities in the church. "Undergraduate" makes a statement which seems to conflict with this fact. Intolerance was the inheritance of Protestantism, but as Protestantism developed, it cast away the legacy. The first Protestants were intolerant—tolerance developed later. Are we to fall back under the yoke of civil intolerance? The *Mail* has apparently no objection; "Undergraduate" none. We have; that is the difference between us.

The objection made by M. A. in a letter in this issue to the want of discrimination by a writer in last week's 'Varsity, between the functions of the University of Toronto and of University College, is, strictly speaking, correct. The writer, however, allowably we think, made use of the word University in the general sense in which it is used the world over. It is only at the Universities of Toronto and London that the distinction so pronouncedly exists.

McMASTER HALL is at once an evidence of modern liberality and of modern intelligence in design and equipment. The students' quarters there form a striking contrast to the Residence of University College, which was built at a time when ventilation was an infant science, and sunlight, for unknown reasons, was looked at with suspicion. McMaster Hall is a place designed for living as well as for learning. The studying and sleeping rooms are heated and ventilated according to the most approved plans; they are full of sunlight, and are airy and cheerful, having nothing of the dingy, damp and dismal appearance of a certain other abode. Had the money expended on the University buildings been directed towards the erection of a college where style and outward appearance were made secondary considerations to economy and usefulness, how much more would the student community have been benefited in the past, and in time to come? The same amount of money otherwise expended would have procured all that University College now possesses, together with at least thrice the present number of apartments, and these of convenient size and properly equipped.

THE removal of the Literary Society from the University Building to Moss Hall (as it is now called) has not in its results fulfilled expectation. The attendance seems to have diminished, and it is asserted that there is an absence of the vigor that formerly marked the proceedings. Resident students particularly seem to have ceased taking part in the exercises. To bring the Society back once more into closer connection with the University might do something towards renewing its former vitality. Accordingly a proposal is on foot to sell or lease (if possible) Moss Hall, and with the proceeds to erect a new building more adapted to the needs of a debating society, and adjoining the University building. The proposition ought to have the best consideration of the members and General Committee of the Society, as the successful carrying out of such a scheme would wholly depend on them. Would it not be a good idea to strike a special committee to report on the subject?

NOTHING is more likely to acquire for University College the good wishes of the community at large than the proposition of the professors to deliver a series of popular lectures on scientific subjects. The lectures are designed specially for skilled mechanics and artisans, and if they are attended as largely as they should be, the result cannot but be satisfactory. Those who are likely to take advantage of these lectures are such as will do so with the expectation of acquiring knowledge which they can employ in their daily work, and by means of which they may be able to invent useful machines, make better bread, improve stoves, perfect ventilating appliances, and do a hundred other such things. Such lectures as these, delivered to practical men, will probably be productive of greater benefits to the country than are the more theoretical lectures given to regular college students. We hope the efforts of President Wilson and his colleagues will receive the attention they merit.

COMMUNICATIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'Varsity.

SIR,—Can you explain how it comes to be so difficult for even University men to distinguish between these two institutions? Your contributor "C.," in his otherwise well-written article on the Western University, says:

"It has been well pointed out that a university ought to subserve two ends—the education of its undergraduates and the encouragement of original research. The former function alone is performed (and inadequately at that) by our Provincial University; the latter is not even attempted. An insufficient endowment prevents substantial progress, and how can we expect an increase of funds if public liberality is to be distracted and weakened by a multiplication of objects?"

Allow me to offset this quotation with two from the Revised Statutes of Ontario. The first is section 4 of Chap. 210:

"There shall be no professorship or other teachership in the said University of Toronto, but its functions shall be limited to the examining of candidates for degrees in the several faculties, or for scholarships, prizes, or certificates of honor in different branches of knowledge, and to the granting of such degrees, scholarships, prizes, and certificates, after examination, in the manner hereinafter mentioned."

The next quotation is part of section 9, Chap. 209, which deals with the constitution and functions of University College:

"There shall be in the said college such professors, lecturers, and teachers, and there shall be taught in the said college such sciences,